

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

PATRICK LLOYD WARNER,

Plaintiff,

-against-

3:15-cv-0807 (LEK/DEP)

HERBERT MANDELL, *et al.*,

Defendants

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court following a Report-Recommendation filed on September 1, 2015, by the Honorable David E. Peebles, U.S. Magistrate Judge, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 72.3. Dkt. No. 5 (“Report-Recommendation”).

Within fourteen days after a party has been served with a copy of a magistrate judge’s report-recommendation, the party “may serve and file specific written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations.” FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b); L.R. 72.1(c). If no objections are made, or if an objection is general, conclusory, perfunctory, or a mere reiteration of an argument made to the magistrate judge, a district court must review that aspect of a report-recommendation only for clear error. Barnes v. Prack, No. 11-CV-0857, 2013 WL 1121353, at *1 (N.D.N.Y. Mar. 18, 2013); Farid v. Bouey, 554 F. Supp. 2d 301, 306-07 & n.2 (N.D.N.Y. 2008); see also Machicote v. Ercole, No. 06 Civ. 13320, 2011 WL 3809920, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 25, 2011) (“[E]ven a *pro se* party’s objections to a Report and Recommendation must be specific and clearly aimed at particular findings in the magistrate’s proposal, such that no party be allowed a second bite at the apple by simply relitigating a prior argument.”). “A [district] judge . . . may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C.

§ 636(b).

No objections were filed in the allotted time period. See Docket. Accordingly, the Court has reviewed the Report-Recommendation for clear error and has found none.

Accordingly, it is hereby:

ORDERED, that the Report-Recommendation (Dkt. No. 5) is **APPROVED and ADOPTED in its entirety**; and it is further

ORDERED, that the Complaint (Dkt. No. 1) is **DISMISSED without prejudice**; and it is further

ORDERED, that if Plaintiff wishes to proceed with this action he must file an amended complaint **within thirty (30) days** of the filing date of this Order; and it is further


ORDERED, that upon the filing of an amended complaint as directed above, the Clerk shall return the file to the Court for further review; and it is further

ORDERED, that in the event Plaintiff fails to file a signed amended complaint **within thirty (30) days** of the filing date of this Order, the Clerk shall enter judgment dismissing this action due to Plaintiff's failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted and to comply with the terms of this Order, without further order of the Court; and it is further

ORDERED, that the Court serve a copy of this Order on all parties in accordance with the Local Rules.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: October 06, 2015
 Albany, New York



Lawrence E. Kahn
U.S. District Judge